

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
City Council Chambers, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, October 6, 2015 - 5:30 p.m.

1. VERIFICATION OF NOTICE

Chair Losoff confirmed that the meeting had been properly noticed.

2. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, & ROLL CALL

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call:

Planning & Zoning Commissioners Present: Chair Marty Losoff, Vice Chair Kathy Levin and Commissioners Avrum Cohen, Eric Brandt, John Currivan, Larry Klein and Gerhard Mayer.

Staff Present: Warren Campbell, Justin Clifton, Audree Juhlin, Matt Kessler, Adam Langford, Cynthia Lovely, Cari Meyer, Robert Pickels, Donna Puckett, Mike Raber and Ron Ramsey.

Councilor(s) Present: Mayor Sandy Moriarty, Vice Mayor Mark DiNunzio and Councilors John Martinez and Jessica Williamson

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS & SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS BY COMMISSIONERS & STAFF

Audree Juhlin introduced our new City Attorney Robert Pickels, who started with the city the middle of July. Robert indicated that he wanted to take the opportunity to introduce himself, because there may be an occasion for him to come before the Commission from time to time, although the Commission is well-represented by Ron Ramsey.

Audree then introduced the two new Assistant Planners -- Adam Langford who began last week and Matt Kessler who started yesterday.

4. DISCUSSION REGARDING THE PROJECT UPDATE SUMMARY

Chair Losoff asked if anything is going on with the Park Place Condominiums, and Cari Meyer indicated there might be something in the next few months. It is for sale and interested buyers are looking at if they could redesign the project. The Chair then asked about CVS, and Cari Meyer indicated they had resubmitted at the beginning of September with the corrections. There were still a few minor outstanding engineering corrections, but those plans came in last week and the engineering staff is reviewing them for any grading and drainage issues. Their plans have been approved from a planning and building perspective, so when they have addressed the outstanding engineering corrections, we will be able to issue permits. The Chair wanted to know if that would be weeks or months and Cari indicated weeks.

Vice Chair Levin asked about why the sewer capacity fees had been invoked in 3.b regarding the Red Earth Preschool. Cari explained that schools are charged capacity fees based on the number of students, and they get some credit for the house capacity fee paid, but there would have been additional capacity fees due. There was a wastewater hearing last week, but she hasn't heard the results of that yet.

Vice Chair Levin then asked why the Sky Ranch Lodge hasn't come forward, and Cari and Audree Juhlin indicated they have not heard from them.

Cari added that there are a couple of new projects as well. The Thai Spices project reapplied for re-approval of their old plan, so you will see that in the next month or so, and they are using the

same plans that had been approved. Additionally, the Farmers Markets have applied for an extension of their CUP. The Chair then thanked Cari for a good report.

5. APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING MINUTES:

a. July 21, 2015 (R)

MOTION: Vice Chair Levin moved for approval of the minutes. Commissioner Cohen seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for, zero (0) opposed and one (1) abstention. (Chair Losoff abstained, because he was not present for that meeting.)

6. PUBLIC FORUM: For items not listed on the agenda within the jurisdiction of the Planning and Zoning Commission – limit of three minutes per presentation. Note that the Commission may not discuss or make any decisions on any matter brought forward by a member of the public.

Chair Losoff opened the public forum and having now requests to speak, closed the public forum.

7. Discussion/possible direction regarding the Western Gateway Community Focus Area Plan (CFA's #1 and #2)

Audree Juhlin noted that it is not typical that the City Manager would attend the meeting; however, we decided that we wanted to do things a little differently to facilitate a more informal discussion about the kind of land uses we are looking at in the Western Gateway CFA, so Justin Clifton graciously volunteered to help facilitate the discussion. The Chair noted that this is an important planning opportunity and there is no right or wrong, so the Planning & Zoning Commission should look at what we want it to look like 20 years from now and how that stage can be set now.

Justin Clifton explained that he offered to facilitate this session, and staff has had a lot of input through the public meetings and this Commission, and we want to facilitate a dialogue, because we have a vision that attempts to be all things that are possible, which in many ways is a reflection of the Community Plan and spans the purview of the Community Plan. He has heard a vision that combines a mixed-use area with people gathering in a vibrant village-like atmosphere, maybe mingling with attendees at a conference center there or to study at an institute of higher innovation or higher education or maybe to heal at the wellness spa; there are public plazas with regular performing arts, diverse people walking from there, diverse housing, and all together, serving as an economic development hub of the community. That is kind of a crude overview, but pulled from some of the dialogue that we have heard both in the community and among Commissioners. What is striking to staff is that with the confines of the space being relatively small, he is not sure that we can accomplish all of those things to the scale that individual Commissioners or members of the public might be envisioning, so the purpose of today's conversation is to play a little bit of "what if". What if we couldn't have all of those things? Are there preferences among these uses? Are there uses that are really compatible together as part of a cohesive vision? And, are there uses that in certain proportions might not be as compatible – that might not add up to the thing you have in mind or they might even conflict with one another? There is no right or wrong answer, but the legacy of land use is apparent in retrospect. Long gone is how extensive the process was or what the developer, Commission, Council or community might have said during public hearings, but we have the remnants of those decisions and that rings loud and clear. When we think about the community we have today and walk down that lane to look at a few pockets of our community as a point of reference for this CFA, we are filled with "Well, if only . . ." or "Boy, if someone would have . . ." or something like that, so we don't mean to draw this process out excessively, but we do think it is a legacy that bears thoughtful consideration, and we need to think as clearly as we can into the future and imagine what we want this place to be, and then reconcile where we might have some tension or some incompatibility to ensure that, in 10 to 20 years or beyond, this is a place that functions the way it was intended to as used land.

Justin indicated that a little more context is that we all know that we are about 70% to 80% built out; we have few large parcels remaining that are ripe for development. We have very little leverage to influence, with the Arizona law the way it is. Really, it is a zone change down the road that gives the community the ability to articulate a stronger vision where some of those entitlements aren't already set in stone, so this is maybe unique to the point that we would say Sedona won't have another opportunity quite like this. Those are the stakes and that is why we spent a little extra time going through this exercise.

Justin explained that in starting, it was important to give reference to our Community Plan. We hold these items in the front of our minds, but it is good to remember some of the major outcomes and themes included in the Community Plan, so that slide is up as a reminder that as we look at these CFAs, we are looking at things like commitment to environmental protection; housing diversity; community gathering places; economic diversity; reduced traffic, and access to Oak Creek, which luckily isn't something we need to delve into today with this particular CFA. Vision themes include environmental stewardship, improved traffic flow, community connections, walkability, economic diversity, sense of place, and everything in this Plan fitting within the concept of sustainability.

Justin referenced the results of a survey that was submitted to the Commission to get a snapshot for the start of a conversation. These results don't represent commitments; they represent a quick point of reference. We might find that even within the results there is a lot of context in that a person might have ranked an item a certain way based on one understanding and that is subject to change.

Justin then displayed the survey results and indicated that to remind everyone of the methodology, staff put out about 15 potential land uses that corresponded to the discussions we've had with the public and with the Commission. We asked the Commission to choose five that would reflect the top five uses and choose five that would reflect the bottom five. There was no ranking within those, so we didn't differentiate between your favored number one and number two land use at this point. You see that towards the top of this list, things like public spaces and education had the highest number of votes to be in the top five land uses. Toward the bottom of the list, we have those land uses that either received the highest frequency of bottom five scores, or on the right, you see a lot of "no response", which means that it didn't fit into the top or the bottom five; they weren't considered in the top or bottom as much as some of the other uses.

Vice Chair Levin asked if all seven Commissioners replied and Justin and Mike Raber indicated that there were six responses. Justin added that this is imperfect and not meant to be indicative of the entire conversation, but he wants to start by asking questions of individual Commissioners about what some of these things mean, as an entry point to reconciling any tension that might exist between any of these land uses and starting to work toward a more common and coherent vision of this CFA. He would ask that this be more of a dialogue, so we have an opportunity to work through these ideas in order.

Commissioner Brandt asked how the process of the whole CFA is to proceed from this point on and how many more meetings staff expects to have. Mike Raber explained that a lot of it depends on what staff hears from the Commission tonight, and where we go from there in terms of coming back with a revised draft. If we have pretty good direction from the Commission that will make a difference in the timeframe and in whether or not we need to do something like this again. Chair Losoff indicated that his sense is that the Commission may need at least one and maybe two meetings after tonight. A follow-up to review the Commission's discussion may be needed, and then either come to a conclusion or keep going on it.

Commissioner Mayer asked when the Commission was going to quit tonight; he gets up at 4 a.m. The Chair indicated that a couple of hours is long, but this is a big discussion that we want to take advantage of. The Commissioner then indicated that regarding the survey, there were a lot of things in the questionnaire that were duplicates regarding housing – living in the community and working there, etc., so the questionnaire was a little confusing. It wasn't if you like this or that; it

was a combination and several questions were duplicates basically. The Chair noted that he also had some reservations on the question, but it was just an attempt to stimulate some ideas from us, and there were things missing on the list that could be put on it. Commissioner Mayer the added that could be a little misleading in terms of what we had in the Community Plan; for instance, assisted living was not in there.

Justin Clifton indicated that there is some method to the madness. We have come a long way in receiving input, but that input is fairly broad and what we want to avoid in the end is a CFA that has so many intended purposes that almost anything fits. We want to try to take a step beyond what is in the Community Plan now and get specific. We see a natural tension between some very destination-based land uses and some more sustainable living land uses, not to say we can't have a mix of both, but we are trying to draw out from what point we should begin working, so when we meet somewhere in the middle of that spectrum, we get the sense of place we are looking for.

Commissioner Mayer indicated that the last time he had mentioned "village", which is comprised of many components that make a village and a community, so there are certain things that don't seem to be a priority at all, like restaurants, cafés, and entertainment. You need a vibrant village rather than a village that is comprised of public spaces that don't mean anything. Education is not necessarily a village where different demographic groups get together, so there are a lot of things that he doesn't really like.

Justin explained that is a perfect segue, because that is exactly the kind of reconciliation we are talking about, and near the top of his list, was to ask in regard to public spaces, if the reason that it ranked relatively high was because people are envisioning that vibrancy. Clearly, not all public spaces have that vibrancy that has been described as part of a village, but he wants to find out if that is what was envisioned by those who put that as a top five land use – something vibrant, the community gathering place referenced in the Community Plan, etc.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that she saw public spaces associated with other uses, not a blank slate or just a space where people might cross paths. She saw it linked to either a conference center or lodging, mixed use or housing, and part of the entire fabric of the village you would want to create. If there were additional educational opportunities available, that would be the kind of space that would be shared by all. Justin asked if that is consistent with what people think of when they think of a public space.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that he would agree with that, but also add that great public spaces are just the streets, walkways and alleyways, to get from one place to another, that give a better porosity that is welcoming. You are able to move around and interact as opposed to dead-end streets, curving streets that you don't know where they go, so he would say that is part of public space.

Chair Losoff agreed that is certainly very public; Commissioner Mayer mentioned "village", and we have been hearing "village" for the 12 years he has been here. His definition of public space would be as a destination point for a convention center and a meeting place for public and private opportunities -- a major convention center of sorts where public and private can convene with indoor/outdoor activities.

Commissioner Mayer explained that he considers a village to be where locals, tourists, everybody gets together, not just resort people who live there for two nights or whatever. He wants to see locals there, and we don't have an uptown where locals meet with tourists, and that is something that is missing – the interaction between the people who come here and leave in four days, but want to get involved in talking to people who live here, and they might want to move here years later, because they liked it.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that when he received the questionnaire, he pulled the community study and went to the vision statement that says to oversee and protect one of the most beautiful

places on Earth. As such, our community actions and decisions must be weighed against the preservation of the beauty of Sedona. The Western Gateway has a lot of beauty to it, and however we develop the Western Gateway, we have to make sure that we don't lose that. One of the problems in the Western Gateway is if you drive in from Cottonwood, you get the Red Rock State Park and the high school, a hotel and another building on the corner, so we need to look at how we use that corner and tie that corner into what we are trying to do and the statement we want to make about Sedona to a first-time visitor; in fact, also to those of us who live here. We want to see what Sedona has to say. When he thinks of public spaces, he thinks of places where people can go and be with other people. Is it commercial and privately owned; does it belong to the people, meaning the city, and we all own it; and how does it play out in terms of wanting the connection of the gateway area to the rest of the city? We can't do something that is different than the rest; it has to be syntonetic with the city as you go through it. He is concerned about what S.R. 89A is going to look like as we develop this. What are we going to put in green space along the road; how are we going to tie in what the medical center is going to be doing and how it is going to look, and how does that affect all of the residents that live behind it and around it, because that is already well-developed? That is how he sees public spaces and how he sees us developing public spaces.

Justin Clifton indicated that we think of a couple, and what he is hearing is the people and that goes back to something Commissioner Mayer mentioned last time. There are people in these spaces; we have some public spaces like the Botanical Gardens at Dry Creek, and it is in-between two lodging establishments, but it doesn't seem to function like the same kind of public space that maybe even the plaza at the pizza place across the street does, or the area outside of Whole Foods, especially when there are venues, so he thinks he is hearing is that these public spaces have that kind of vibrancy. They most likely are connected to something like commercial space, because in spite of having substantial people at both of those lodges, the reason the gardens aren't frequented more is because they are not connected to another draw the same way as going out for a pizza at the end of the day functions as a draw. He then asked if he is accurate or off-base.

Chair Losoff stated that he thinks that is getting to it. One of the issues that we have to challenge ourselves with, because this is such a key component for the city, is that it has to tie-in with a lot of things. We have the high school with the auditorium, which is public, and he would tie that in with the whole process as well, so there are a lot of components. We keep hearing about education and for years we have heard culinary, but have we challenged ourselves as to what the educational component should be? Should it be AU, NAU or some other college; why are we locked into culinary? As we look at these things, it is not only just how we define it, but to really challenge our assumptions as we go forward.

Justin asked if they could move on to education then; however, Commissioner Currivan wanted to add one thing. When he thinks of a public space, the first thing that comes to his mind is a public square. Something like you see in Prescott or Santa Fe; that type of public square is something that you have to decide as a policy matter whether or not you want, because as Justin pointed out, we don't have unlimited space there. Additionally, if you were to have a public square, you have to decide who is going to own it. Is it going to be owned by the city, in which case, you may have the city needing to buy some land that is currently privately owned, so there may be funding issues involved. On the other hand, you may be able to have some kind of business association that jointly owns the square and they have businesses surrounding it, such as restaurants, bars, retail, etc. They can also be combined with housing on the second floor and that creates a built-in population for that square where people want to shop and eat there on occasion, so it becomes a drawing point, a destination for people who live in the area and for people who visit Sedona. They have heard about this area and want to go there to see what is going on. A lot of times things just happen spontaneously there. Musicians might be playing or something like that, so it is worth considering that, but you have to consider whether we want to devote the space to that or not. If we had the space for it, it would be very nice. It is a tradeoff, but that is a public space that is worthy of the name.

Justin indicated that moving on to education, the land here is scarce and the thresholds are meaningful, so while we could find a way to put a bubble on the map to represent all of these things, what is harder to do is visualize if that allocation of space leads to the environment. For this vibrancy, whether it is visitors at a hotel or locals as part of a mixed use kind of environment, you need to have enough of it, and when we think of our community and pick an intersection, we can identify where we are getting close to that threshold, where we have it, and where we clearly don't. That is why this is so important to get down to how much of the land should be dedicated to these things and, at some point, are we comfortable with the fact that there might not be enough space left for something?

Chair Losoff added that in talking about public spaces, several had mentioned that of the few CFAs the Commission has looked at, we are all talking about some of the same things, and we can't be all things to all people; one shoe doesn't fit all, so if we are going to have a public space here, we may not need it there or vice versa, so we have to tie it all in someplace. Justin stated that it is the same with a lot of these and education is a perfect example; we have a facility there. We have a high school across the street and a Yavapai College campus, so it makes sense to think there is some synergy there already. Of course, it occurs to most of us in Sedona that at least the college campus seems grossly underutilized, so from a staff perspective, we are begging the question; is the idea of additional educational facilities a nice vision or a realistic future. To put it bluntly, even with regard to some potential other relationships as a visionary component, what if it is not feasible?

Commissioner Mayer stated that we are actually at the mercy of Yavapai College for that facility, whatever they do. They have complete control over it; we don't, and putting something there that is underutilized, as you said, what else are you going to add to it? Whether it is utilized more or not, you cannot add to it without their permission. Secondly, the people in West Sedona have no gathering place at all. There is nothing where they can come together, except the grocery stores and the post office. That is where he meets people he hasn't seen for years; it is sad that we don't have any place. He lived in Ireland and a village consists of a few houses around the church and a pub. After church, they go to the pub and have a few pints and the gig gets going and they have some fun, so there has to be some fun and a mix of stuff for young and old people as well. It can't be just another resort and area where only tourists will be there; we have to have our own space where we go and have gatherings and maybe a martini or whatever.

Chair Losoff indicated that regarding education, he would challenge the city; he doesn't know if we are locked into Yavapai College. Yes, there are restrictions, but if we are looking 20 years out, do we buy the property and use it for whatever educational purposes we want down the road? Yes, today we are limited, but we are not looking at today, so he would hope those are the kinds of things we are looking at. Justin agreed and indicated that just because we don't have much of a presence today means that we would never, but Yavapai College has an advantage over everybody else and that is the property tax collected locally, and if with that, there isn't the overwhelming demand, and considering that we are 70% to 80% built out, there is going to be a continued challenge to have something beyond what that campus has been at its peak, but that is just a hunch.

Justin then suggested, assuming that it could be vibrant, he would point out something that is an overarching theme of this whole discussion, with education, wellness spa and conference facility, those are three large footprints and substantially destination-oriented type uses. Not to say that they don't belong or don't contribute to vibrancy, but you are starting to occupy a lot of the space with the kinds of facilities that most people would use on rare occasion – not to say that a conference center wouldn't have new people there all the time, but it is in distinction to the square, mixed use, some of the retail and restaurants, entertainment, and things that are all ranked a little lower. In spite of the idea that maybe we could have all of that; we run the risk of splitting the baby by telling ourselves that we could do well at all of those things and have a public square with mixed use, enough residential to make it feel like a community and still incorporate these other kinds of uses that are most likely destinations for people outside.

Justin added that when we are looking at all of these in isolation and trying to probe deeper about what it is about education that we find so appealing, in general, we are also going to go back to that more conceptual idea of destination-oriented uses and the sustainable community kinds of uses. Frankly, you would need to get a lot of housing and a variety of types of housing, mixed use and retail, and different kinds of commercial space to get the vibrancy you are talking about. Commissioner Mayer added that you have to have people living there actually. Stores close at 6 p.m. or whatever and everything is empty. You are going to have to have living people on the second floor, working downstairs and those kinds of things.

Chair Losoff asked if we are going to challenge Sedona; we're not spread out, we are basically contained. It takes maybe nine minutes to get from his house in the Lazy Bear uptown area to West Sedona. If we wanted mixed-use units, multi-family housing density, does it have to be here? He is not saying we should or shouldn't, just as the devil's advocate, we can't be all things to all people and we can't have everything all over, so the reality is what makes sense?

Commissioner Klein indicated that he noticed from the land use survey that of the top five items public spaces, education and conference all got 4s. If you are going to have a conference center, generally when he goes to a convention, he is going to stay where the convention is. He doesn't want to have to drive; he wants to be able to walk right there, so if you are talking about a conference center in the cultural park, you probably would need a place for people to stay, and it was interesting that resorts got two in the top five and three in the bottom five, and hotels got no top five and four in the bottom five, and he presumes that the thinking on some of that is maybe we have enough lodging units in Sedona and that doesn't provide any more economic diversity. For some of the things we have been talking about, you have to look at if the owner of the land is going to be willing to do that, because if the landowner isn't willing to build some of these things, then what is going to happen? Is the city going to buy the property, so those things can be built or is the landowner going to sell to someone else, and then what are they going to want to do? It is great to talk about all of these things; you want education, arts, maintain open spaces, access to the National Forest, etc., but is the developer going to be willing to do that? When he looked at this survey, right or wrong, he took into account what the current owner wants to do with the property. He presented a proposal in June or July and a lot of the things he has on here would satisfy some of the community expectations. He has a conference center and a resort to go with it; he has a wellness village, open space, a campus of innovation, the community pool, gardens, event space, café, arts studios, gathering hall, restaurant, garden market, plazas, and it is his understanding that the key to Mr. Tennyson's proposal was that he wants to build a five-star hotel, and he has asked us previously if we are going to be willing to move the blue Lodging Area Limit line, because the way the line is in the Community Plan now, he wouldn't be able to build the resort, so do we need to look at that? He had asked if we could do this by the fall at the latest, because his investors are worried about the Fed raising interest rates, so should we consider tonight, even though it probably wouldn't be binding, voting on whether or not we would be willing to move the blue Lodging Area Limit line, so Mr. Tennyson could build the five-star resort that he wants, that is the key to his whole project, which does provide a lot of the other things we want. If not, he is worried about the Fed raising the interest rates, which they say may happen in November or December, and if he decides he is not going to be able to build what he wants, what will happen to this property? That is something we need to take a look at.

Chair Losoff indicated that it is premature at this point; we are looking at the whole Gateway, not just the cultural park, and it consists of the school, healthcare and other components, so he is not sure if we are ready to make those decisions. We've got to remember his presentation on the cultural park, but again, in reacting to a developer's request, and Justin wants us to comment on the entire Gateway. Then, we can go back and see what those components are.

Commissioner Mayer pointed out that if you get something going like Commissioner Klein said, then you have other things to follow, so something has to happen in that regard, and if we approve something which makes sense to everybody, the other things will fall in place, so if we are going to just sit on it and boil it and re-boil it until it is completely disintegrated, then things are going to go

away. As Commissioner Klein said, investors might be lined up and the patience is running out. The interest rates are going up; it is a time of opportunity to get something down to the point where it looks like we can accomplish that, and it would be a starting point.

Commissioner Cohen stated that we have all of these potential uses and talked about stuff; we've heard from the developer, but he doesn't have any statistics. What are the number of a, b, c or d? What is the potential? If we build what the developer wants to build and the Marriott is across the street and we have the Hyatt, etc., are we overbuilding in a certain direction? He has no idea, so statistics would help and it is the same with restaurants. We have restaurants opening and closing all the time, so it would be helpful to understand, because the core population that is going to use this stuff is the residents, and we have been in the 10,000 number for a while now. Maybe we need housing to get to 11,000, but what will these people support during the off-season; he has no idea. The Chamber is working very hard to attract tourists and that could be very helpful, because they have been increasing tourists, but statistics would be very helpful.

Justin indicated that he is hearing that we are going back to the big picture, but we should move on in the presentation and maybe we will come back to specific uses. There is another component that staff would like to share that might help recreate this context. Chair Losoff added that the Commission won't forget Commissioner Klein's and Commissioner Mayer's comments; we will go back to that before we finish. Justin noted that he was going to segue into that with this next piece.

Commissioner Klein indicated that we are supposedly dealing with both the Community Focus Area for the cultural park and the health services, and basically, all we have talked about is the cultural park. Several meetings ago, there was a request to contact some people at the hospital to find out what is going on with them, because we have no idea what their plans are with regard to the development of the 20+ acres in the health services area. It seems that maybe we should just consider the cultural park separately, because it seems that nothing is happening with regard to the health services issue, and do we want that to delay any decision made for the cultural park area?

Justin stated that to the first point about a vision proposed by a developer, the context of where we are today, and having an anchor or something as a starting point and then taking off, his caution to the Commission is do not do land use planning as a reactive exercise. If we think about the parts of our community that we like the best and the things that we would do differently, in every one of those cases of the things we would do differently, there was a Commission and a Council that was responsive to a request. He is not saying that we avoid strong and healthy partnerships with private landowners -- that is important, but he lives near the Dry Creek intersection, one we will look at in a little while, and when he walks there, he thinks we have a community gathering place -- the pizza place. He walks with his family on a Friday and he sees people from the community, colleagues that he works with and locals, but that is a small area and he imagines that if one of the other corners, where there happens to be lodging, which is okay, and then there is another lodge to the west, but if one of those other corners more than one lot deep was something similar, such as retail space or public space where people gathered, would there be more vibrancy? Would it start to look more like a village? He thinks so; these thresholds are really important, and while it is tempting and maybe even the right thing to say maybe we can have it all, when we start to look at our community and the spaces we have, we realize that sometimes we cross a threshold and lose something and sometimes we can't go back. He is not saying we don't have some of all of this; he is saying it is really important to try to drill down on how much, because of the impact of that. No one will remember how long it took to get through the process or if a property sold or investors left. He doesn't mean to disregard the interests of a property owner; they are critical, but that will not last. What will last is what this place becomes and it will last virtually forever.

Chair Losoff stated that he in part agrees with Commissioner Mayer in let's get something going, but on the other hand, we've had enough projects come before us and they have got to get it approved, got to get it done, and then nothing happens. We approve it and it sits and expires, so there is no guarantee, although that is not to say that it is not a viable idea, but that there is no guarantee that something will happen even if it is moved forward. We've come close on the cultural

park a couple of times, but it fell down, so we have to be careful, given the importance of this gateway, to not be over-reactive to a developer yet. Let's see where we are going with all of this, but he is one of seven, so we have to take it into consideration.

Justin suggested looking at a few of our own areas in the community. To the point about statistics and getting a better frame of reference for what these ratios are all about, this is a struggle for staff as much as anybody, because there is no perfect blueprint. Chair Losoff interrupted to ask if he wanted to comment on the hospital first, and Justin explained that we have had some limited conversations, and some of the uses they have in mind are relatively self-contained. They might not react substantially with the rest of the area, especially if it ends up being a graduated care facility. Typically, the amenities in those facilities, which would include hair dressers and cafes, etc., are provided on site, that is not to say that there wouldn't be any integration, but potentially less, so we realize there is an employment base there and people that would interact within this area, but he doesn't know that the uses on the remaining acreage would – at least not to the extent that almost any of these other uses would.

Commissioner Mayer noted that it still comes down to the cultural park, and Justin indicated he also thinks so and that is what represents the really unique opportunity here frankly that we don't have anywhere else in Sedona. Justin then explained that we wanted to say what these thresholds are about, what it looks like when we examine more closely the ratio of housing to lodging, visitors to tourists, etc., so staff took three areas. In the exhibits, the first is north Uptown where we drew some boundaries, and he wouldn't be too caught up in specific boundaries, because we wanted to get a snapshot as a sense of how these places look statistically, since we know how they feel when we are in these places. What we think is significant here is that of the total acreage dedicated to commercial development, 57% is lodging. Then we were looking at units or another way to think about it is residence to visitors, and 63% of it is lodging, and this is just capacity. There are people that are sometimes not in their homes year-around and the hotels aren't always full, but we are going to try to give you a reference point and we all know that north Uptown has a heavy concentration of tourist activities, and he is assuming that even those that live there would say that, but that is not to say that it doesn't have vibrancy or that it is a place that people don't want to go, but it has a character that is different than other places in Sedona. His intuition might be similar to yours that this has something to do with that. As we move on to the next example, we looked at the Dry Creek area; again the graph is really looking at out of the total commercial space, 25% is dedicated to lodging and you will notice the boundary goes back beyond City Hall and over to the Fire District, so that is not exactly a cohesive walkable space, but it is a chunk of land that when you look at it closely has some lodging, but actually many more commercial spaces that are non-lodging compared to Uptown. Similarly, you have more residential spaces, both single-family and multi-family than you have lodging. He thinks we would all agree that Dry Creek feels a little different than Uptown. Going to the third example, the Coffee Pot area, which to him of the three feels the most on the community end of the spectrum, and that is not to say that there aren't any tourists, but it is generally a place of commerce for residents in comparison to Uptown and Dry Creek, and that bears out in the statistics. Out of the total commercial space only 21% is dedicated to lodging, and if you look at total units or think of this as residents compared to visitors, again only 20% are tourists, so he is seeing a bit of a spectrum with north Uptown on one end and Coffee Pot on the other and Dry Creek somewhat in the middle. Referencing the exhibit, Justin pointed out that it represents that kind of vertically, but you can see the point, you have the dark blue compared to the light blue or the blue compared to the yellow, and as you go down, you have more of a community or community types of uses that aren't as attractive perhaps to the tourists. So, one of the questions is, as we look at the Western Gateway, is there one of these or a combination of these uses that seems like the right starting point? When we looked at those ratios for this area before we really start to talk about new development, it is already 43% within the CFA given what is being built and what exists, which includes Diamond that is a little unique in terms of lodging, but certainly in terms of people cycling through and looking for certain resources, they are probably more like tourists than residents, although it functions differently than a standard hotel. Therefore, this area is closer to Uptown in terms of that ratio than we give it credit for, but just going back to what this Commission and residents have said about the "village", is that what we mean by "village"

or does it mean something else? Do we need to try to carve out some additional space for mixed uses, a variety of housing and other retail space to compensate for the landscape that is already there to achieve balance through deliberate allocation of the land use? That is not to say that we couldn't accommodate, in the reactive part of this process, a request from any landowner, but how much and to what scale? How much of this land do you want to occupy with some of those uses that might make it so it never functions quite like that village, at least not for local residents?

Commissioner Cohen stated that one thing was left out. Where do you see this stuff that goes into the Western Gateway for residents and where do you see it goes in for tourists; how is it coordinated and how is it connected to the rest of Sedona? Justin explained that to some extent that is a question that we address after we decide if there is one vision or the other preferred, because if the majority of this space is other things like a resort and wellness spa and there is a space left in the middle for a little commercial development and mixed use, then that is your answer; it belongs wherever it fits in, but if on the other hand, the direction is to keep some of those other uses, prioritize among them, but carve out a much larger space, then we have something we can work with to integrate.

Commissioner Mayer asked how much space is needed for the resort, wellness and that kind of stuff from the remaining 43 acres, and Mike Raber noted it is about 42 to 44 acres total, and we looked at the study done for the city in 2004 and the conference study done for the Fitch Group for the cultural park in 2007, and the 2004 study suggested the facility would need at least seven acres, and then another couple of acres for the lodging on site, and that would accommodate the parking as well, and that fits fairly closely with the proposal you saw from the property owner with about nine acres for a resort, and they had another 6.5 acres for the wellness spa. Commissioner Mayer noted that 15 to 20 acres leaves a lot of acreage.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that we need to come back to the thought of the string of pearls notion. A way to create more focused activity areas is to think of them as a string of pearls connected by transit or that can function as community gathering places on their own. He is not sure that we actually have any in this town that function 100%. Uptown could be that way, but most locals would say no; there is nothing up there for them. There is a critical mass of people there, so why don't we encourage more uses up there that would bring locals up, and that would be a way to make it more viable and village-like. Of the examples given, he is not sure that any of them really function the way the Community Plan expects them to function, so with these larger pieces of property, because he is not going to discount the medical center area, with the proper densities and the proper mix, there could be its own or be connected with a complete street, as it has been discussed, and the highway should be a complete street. It shouldn't be a highway; it should be a boulevard. He is not sure that we are going to find that recipe of what is commercial and what is lodging and what is residential. In this city, there is enough low-density housing that we don't have to worry about that. If you look at the area, you'll notice that the houses are kind of spread really thin, and we've got about a half-mile by half-mile and a quarter-mile by a quarter-mile, so he doesn't agree that there isn't room for all of this. Philosophically speaking, you asked what the right mix is, and we should go back to what we want to see in those places, but it might be easier to say what we don't want to see in those places and work it from there.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that there is no category for recreational services, and without recreational services, he is not sure there is a draw here for residents who don't live from Dry Creek to the high school. That needs to be put into the mix, and one of the questions is if we are going to allow a resort to be built, what about a golf course? How much land does that take? It seems to be important in this community, so recreational services for him would be important for a draw. We also have a parking problem with the high school and Performing Arts Center; we don't have enough and that would be important to look at. How does that fit in and where does it go? That is an issue that needs to be looked at. His other thought is when we look at education, the State of Arizona is in deep trouble when it comes to money for education and educators, and we have a problem with the same thing here, so how do we keep teachers. One of the problems is that they are very low paid, and there is no housing for them and their families that would allow them to be

able to work. What if we built subsidized housing, so as part of their remuneration, they get some housing that would be of a lower cost and we could restrict it to teachers, firemen, police, etc., but subsidized housing for these folks we need that we are not providing enough salary to do what they would want to do might be something to look at in this area, and it is near the high school, so it could be helpful.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that she couldn't support the golf course idea, and Commissioner Cohen noted that the question that was asked was how much land was needed for the resort, and a golf course needs more land. The Vice Chair pointed out that we have two really important neighbors. We have established neighborhoods and we have the Forest Service. Added to that, we have extraordinary cultural values in terms of views, so as we discuss this, we have to keep in mind that we want to preserve green space along S.R. 89A and thread it through any development, and make substantial appropriate linkages to the Forest Service and our trail system, so we further that as a recreational opportunity, while keeping our neighbors in mind -- the public neighbors, our public lands and our established neighborhoods.

Justin asked if there is a sense among the Commissioners as to which of these uses or some combination of them are most compatible with the existing surrounding neighborhoods; that may be another way to look at it. To some extent, we are going to end up having the same conversation, and depending on which of these pieces we pull out, if it is conference center, resort, wellness and some green space, etc., then we get to the point where there isn't much acreage left, and that is the point. Bear in mind, the purview of a Community Focus Area is not prescriptive. At some point, by the time it is a Planned Development or something like that maybe, but right now; it is conceptual and it could be five or ten years before somebody else sitting in your seats say now we have an application to develop a portion of this, and they are either going to have a very broad menu of things, in which case, it can take almost any shape by the end or we are going to set some floors and ceilings and say that we want to preserve in this space at least a certain amount for something like mixed use. We want there to be a certain ratio of commercial to non-lodging commercial to the lodging that exists, and do some things to try to shape it, even if it is all of these things. If all we do is react to the request when one of these things come forward, it is just going to look however it looks in the end, and each decision-maker will be looking at that application a little bit in isolation, and the CFA won't provide a lot of guidance at that point. As we get back to things like education and the neighbors, we really are asking if push comes to shove or as we finalize this document, do we want some emphasis in some places or do we want to leave it sufficiently broad and say that any of these things will be a strong application?

Vice Chair Levin indicated that she could see where two significant land uses would be complementary, and that would be housing, lodging and a conference space, because there are very well known developments that incorporate them and they have shared public and private facilities, so if your economic engine is the conference center and there is a niche for that here at a certain size that we are not now performing, you can complement the use of a conference center with a resort facility, if it has an emphasis on wellness, and wellness would also be another economic engine if it provided the kinds of unique services that are frankly destination services. You can add to that experience with access to the Forest Service, but you can really integrate housing well, because there are many developments that do that now. All of the amenities, whether they are public spaces or grass lawns, sidewalks or bike paths or equestrian uses, they are open to all.

Commissioner Klein asked if we want to recommend putting enough tourist amenities in the cultural park area, so you would hopefully take some tourists out of the Uptown and Tlaquepaque area and bring them out here, and would that help reduce traffic, because the two biggest traffic problems are in Uptown and S.R. 179; could we potentially draw enough tourists to this area to help the traffic flow in those areas?

Chair Losoff indicated that in a break-out session of the Community Plan Steering Committee, it was suggested to make traffic in Uptown up or down to the canyon, and move all of the retail businesses to the cultural park, but that didn't go over too well.

The Chair then indicated that he would open the public comment period; however, Vice Chair Levin suggested first finding out if Justin was finished with his presentation. Justin indicated that we could go on for a little while; we don't have the feedback we are looking for in terms of preferences. We would like a mix of all of these things, and at some point, we want to get to whether or not we want to put some emphasis on any of this or not. Chair Losoff asked if the survey didn't show that; four wanted public spaces, education and conference and three wanted wellness and neighborhood services. Justin stated that potentially it does, but it is not consistent with a lot of what has been described as a village and a village with some locals. It is a viable alternative vision for this area to say that it is going to be a gateway and function as a tourist center, and if you put a visitor center, hotel and wellness, although he is not exactly clear on what a wellness and resort spa is; they meet somewhere on a spectrum, but if you put those things out there, you might just go all the way with that and create a kind of synergy where you have tourists and amenities for tourists, and that might be exactly what the area calls for. What we want to be clear about is, and it might be a philosophical difference of opinion, but he doesn't think you can have both the way they have been described, and he doesn't think the staff of professional planners think you can have both the way they have been described, so we are either going to say we want both and let it progress the way it progresses or start to shape that vision with a little more detail.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that page 37 of the Community Plan states, "As follows for community expectations", and it is his understanding that the CFA is not supposed to recreate what the Community Plan did, but to enhance the Community Plan, so "1. Provide a center for education, research, arts and events. Land use options should remain flexible to further these interests. 2. Coordinate objectives between property owners, Yavapai College, and the Sedona Red Rock High School for educational programs. 3. Maintain access to National Forest trails." That is the guide we are supposed to use based on the job we've been given, which is to create a CFA that deepens what the Community Plan calls for, but if that is wrong please tell him. Chair Losoff stated that he is right on and if you look at those six bullet points, it is the things we have talked about here, but puts it in more perspective and gives you more of a forced priority.

Justin again explained that staff wants to move beyond that list and say what the relative scale is of some of those things. What is the relative importance of some of those things; otherwise, we end up with a CFA that is really a reiteration of what is in the Community Plan already, so we are trying to refine that vision to capture a little more tone, emphasis and prioritization.

Chair Losoff asked Justin to ask his question again and the Commissioners will go around the table and answer it the best they can; again this is conceptual and not written in stone, and no decisions will be made tonight. Justin then indicated he would like to ask a simple "if, then" question. If you had to pick a direction to work from -- the mixed use, residential, commercial end of the spectrum or the conference center, wellness center, educational facilities that occupy larger footprints and then see what is left end of the spectrum, which end of that spectrum should we be working from, when we consider a development proposal for this CFA?

Commissioner Mayer stated that we haven't asked the landowner and we don't know what the investors are interested in, so the financial viability of anything has to be considered. The Chair suggested just answering in terms of what we think. The Commissioner then indicated that he sees a happy medium, and when he asked for the space needed for a conference center, wellness center and resort, he would give it about 20 acres, but there is still a lot of acreage left. He needs to see a vibrant village-type with all of those other things around it. The Chair then asked if Commissioner Mayer is in favor of a little bit of everything and the Commissioner stated yes, because he would like to have a place to go, besides Basha's and Safeway, where he can hang out and have a beer, a martini and interact with tourists and locals, meet his friends, etc. There is no

place; if he walks the dog, he sees the City Manager and Commissioner Klein occasionally, but that is about it.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that he agreed with Commissioner Mayer and he doesn't see this as just one landowner, he sees this as a whole CFA that has been combined from two CFAs; there are two ends of this and there is a bunch of stuff in-between, so why are we just looking at one cultural park spot? He keeps hearing resort, but he doesn't think that is the right thing for this property. A resort to him is a sprawling place with golf courses, all of its open space is closed off; it is a space to get around. We need to make this more of a place that is welcoming to the whole city and it needs to heal the things that people are looking for, when they were asking about what was needed for the city, and they wanted community gathering places. A resort has limited attraction; a hotel, great everybody can use a hotel and people in the city can go to the restaurant, but he is differentiating between a hotel and a resort. If you take those big things out, like no golf courses, that is kind of extreme, but let's think about that. If you take those things out, then there is room for everything, so he doesn't agree that it has to be either/or. We can fit everything, if you look at the big picture – the whole property. Chair Losoff then asked if both Commissioners are saying that all CFAs should be the same, and Commissioner Brandt stated no, it is not going to be all medical on one side or it has to be medical on the other side. The Chair noted that we have talked high density, community gathering places, etc., in a couple of other CFAs as well. Commissioner Brandt stated that he is for high density with open space, so it makes it more walkable and easier for people to get around; it makes it more of a community, so that to him is a given and part of it. Not that we are increasing overall density, but that it is looked at as a denser place that is easier to walk around and meet people.

Commissioner Currivan indicated he had a question to ask later as to how we accomplish any of this, but to answer the question, he tends to lean toward the village concept. He likes the public square concept, the mixed use, the retail with some housing mixed in, and that also gives us an opportunity to create some housing opportunities for teachers and other people who live in Sedona and are having trouble living here now. It would also give us an opportunity for some synergy between this area and the medical area, because we talked about the age-in-place concept and the fact that we may want some things that are senior living-oriented in that area and those could be worked into that concept as well.

Vice Chair Levin thanked Justin for forcing the Commission into two boxes, and she sees the viability of both. She sees the viability of a wellness/conference-based facility in that area with connections to the neighborhood and Forest Service providing the kind of spaces that would invite us into them, as well as a mixed use with emphasis on neighborhood services – what they would like to see in all of the west end that would enable them to make short stops to restaurants or small cafes or mini-markets or organic farmers' markets, so she sees both of those as viable, and she also sees the point that we can't do it all.

Commissioner Cohen stated that if he has to choose, it would go with what Commissioner Currivan stated with one addition, which is if this is truly a gateway, then it has to be created in such a way that it looks like a gateway to the city.

Commissioner Klein indicated that he wouldn't really want to choose, but if he had to choose and he looks at what is in the Community Plan, he would choose the mixed use, residential, commercial mainly for the reason that it probably would be a little more compatible with the community expectations for the cultural park than a resort and conference center, but he agrees with Commissioner Mayer, Commissioner Brandt and Vice Chair Levin that he doesn't see why you can't have both. He also liked Commissioner Brandt's distinction between a hotel and a resort. Just referring to Mr. Tennyson's plan when he says resort, he is not sure what that means, but you don't want a big sprawling thing; a hotel would probably be okay. So, if he had to choose, he would choose the first one only because it is the most compatible with what is set forth in the Community Plan, but again, he appreciates the comment that you don't want to react to the developer, but at the same time, we could propose all of this stuff, but if it is not going to be something that a

developer is going to be able to profit on, they are not going to build it. If it is not going to be built, it isn't going to happen unless the city is going to buy the land or some other developer thinks maybe a profit can be made doing more of the mixed use, residential and commercial, but if he has to choose one, that is what he would choose.

Chair Losoff stated that the Commission needs at least one or two more meetings before we get back to the issues about specifically the cultural park, but in any case, he is in the minority, because he would lean toward the conference center concept. He is looking at all CFAs and this CFA should distinguish itself with that concept. The mixed use, multi-family housing, retail is good in some other CFAs, but this particular CFA is a gateway and it should be broader-based in the bigger picture. We also should sit down with the board of directors of the hospital, not just somebody, and get the school involved to look at the big picture. What are their plans? It is difficult; there are some typical relationships perhaps with the school board, but before settling in on this stuff, we need to know specifically what the hospital is doing, not just through a third party or lower level individuals, but the top level. We have been speculating what the hospital wants to do, but we haven't heard from them directly, and he doesn't know if they have heard this conversation directly from us. Maybe the cultural park people have, but then again, that is almost a different kind of conversation, so he would like to see us do that; that is a key component.

The Chair then asked Justin if he got his answer, and Justin explained that it is more of an answer than it might appear to some. We are talking about some mix, and as we write this plan with the final wording, what he had asked was from which direction do we work, so one model might have been you put in all of those first desired uses and then see what is left. The other model might be to carve out a space to create this vibrancy and then see what is left. You still end up with a mix in the end, but from which direction you start from or depart from is important, so we have gotten some of that and he believes that is fairly helpful, and when you see the final language, you will see that reflected in the draft.

Mike Raber added that the medical center has been aware of all of the meetings; they have attended and actually spoken at some of the public forums, so they are very plugged into the process. He has worked with Rick Peterson; he is not a board member, but he is the staff member that we have been working with regarding land use issues and he meets with the board. The Chair indicated that a good summit meeting with the various key stakeholders – school board, hospital board and a couple of the landowners would be important.

Justin then indicated that it would be a good opportunity to see if there are comments from the public; we have some initial direction. The Chair then asked staff to return with a summary for the next meeting as to what was discussed today and give a review of today's meeting, and then the Commission can see if it wants to take it further with specific recommendations, be it on the whole concept of the CFA or the two recommendations you heard from Commissioner Klein and Commissioner Mayer about doing something now on the cultural park, etc.

Justin indicated that staff could do that, but he would leave the Commission with one thought to come back to. If we have this combination of uses that in many ways look similar to combinations of uses we have across town, and yet, we all feel that we've never accomplished the kind of synergy, the kind of village description that we keep going back to, so one thing to inform staff on is what to do different. It might be to answer the question of what would have to change in our existing environment to create this feeling you are talking about. Is it a ratio of uses, is it connectivity through the space, what is it that makes it not work in other places when they have a similar mix of the kinds of things we are talking about now?

Commissioner Currian asked how we move forward. Let's suppose that we could all agree on exactly what the vision is and we decide if we want a public square, a conference center, etc., and we all agree and the City Council took whatever action was necessary, so everybody is in agreement, then what are the next steps? As you know the property is privately owned and usually we end up in a reactive mode when somebody comes forward with a proposal, so if we come up

with a plan that says we want a public square here and an arts center over there, etc., that may or may not correspond with what the property owner has in mind, so how do we go forward on that? That would be useful for the Commission to know, so we see where we are heading once we get a consensus on the use of the property. Justin indicated that staff could do that.

Chair Losoff stated that another request for a future meeting is the request for some statistics, such as hotel occupancy, and the first couple of maps were good, showing the percentage of lodging versus residential.

The Chair then opened the public comment period and having no requests to speak, the Chair invited the representative from NAU to speak.

Margo Wheeler, NAU: Stated that this is her third visit to Sedona to bring her freshman planning class, and she has six students with her tonight. She has to put in a plug that Sedona has new planners from NAU's program, so she is very pleased about that. This is her freshman class that she brings to Sedona for them to see the Commission in action, and having done this for a few decades, it is old home week, so she is pleased to have the opportunity to hear the deliberations tonight, it was particularly interesting and her students got a good introduction to the public side of public planning, so she appreciates your generosity, and one of the city's planners spoke at her class this week also.

Ben Davis, NAU: Indicated that he has been a resident of Sedona for his entire life, and he is studying Civil Engineering, and one of the things that came up about subsidized living for teachers peaked his interest, as he has had a number of teachers that have been in the area and had to move away simply because they could not afford to live here anymore, and the community itself would be in high promotion of that.

Having no additional requests to speak, the Chair closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Mayer asked if they were going to have a dry spell again until the next meeting, and the Chair indicated that he didn't know, the Commission would find out from Audree.

Commissioner Brandt referenced the land use survey and indicated that we had touched on the fact that health/medical services and senior living weren't put in as a land use, and in addition to that, there wasn't any of the connection to the Forest Service's National Forest as far as our discussions about an orientation sign and all of the other type of connections for trails, etc., so that is an important part of this CFA, because it is a major connection to major portions of recreation in the forest. He has been thinking about the trailhead that is on the private property at the cultural park, and why there isn't an easement for the public's use on the private property, and he would like to hear if this is a wrong supposition, but the whole cultural park was looked at to be a community space. It was an amphitheater, with the college or other entities in-between and it was all to be public space, so if it is public space, then why would we need an easement for the public on it, but things change and it is not that way, so he thinks it is a very important part of the mix, and we should be looking at the trailhead uses, and if the Forest Service doesn't want a trailhead there, it is still an important part of the history of the land to the people of Sedona and the Verde Valley and the people of the world in the National Forest, so he will be looking for that to be continuing in its existing location.

Chair Losoff commented that the Forest Service is another stakeholder to include in a summit, and he then asked staff for thoughts about follow-up meetings. Audree Juhlin indicated that it will take one or two more meetings to really dial down those ratios of uses, so staff can summarize what was heard tonight and bring that to another work session, and then further refine that based on some of the remaining outstanding questions. If we then have enough information, we will more refine the base draft in place now, and if we are ready, we will bring it back for a public hearing and possible recommendation to the City Council. The Chair asked if staff would be ready for the next public hearing on October 20th, and Audree indicated that staff could summarize this meeting and provide

some further direction on the 15th or 20th. The Chair then recapped that the Commission wants to see a summary of today and some of the statistical information, plus some of the other issues that came up, and given tonight, he thinks the Commission is two meetings away.

Justin asked if there are any specific statistics the Commission would like. Staff generated some ideas about the ratios to create some context, but is there anything else. Commissioner Cohen indicated that he likes to work from data, and he would like to have some notion of how a hotel on this site would add to the amount of rooms available. He would like to know something about the projection of traffic; our department that does that has been very good particularly on the CVS project. He would like to have some notion of housing numbers; some projection on where we're going in terms of new residents and how we have to care for them. He would like to know something about the school system and how bad our teacher situation really is and that we would be doing something about that, with an opportunity here to do something. One of the things that seems to be missing that you hear at the visitors' center on S.R. 179 is a lot of people don't have a sense of . . . , the town closes up so early and what are they going to do in the evening? Commissioner Mayer said it best, there is no place to go for a beer, and when he sees him at Safeway, they don't get a beer together, but those kinds of numbers would help take a look at the kinds of questions we are looking at. Also, the Community Plan was worked on very hard; he didn't happen to have the privilege to be on any of the committees for it, but he knows how much work was put into it, and he would like us to stay within the direction where the Community Plan pointed us, because the CFA is supposed to enhance the Community Plan, not override it, so that is what he was looking at when he was asking for data. Chair Losoff then asked staff to do what they can; the school situation is very complex, it is not just housing. We are the lowest paid, etc., but do what you can.

The Chair then asked if there would be a work session on the 15th and a meeting on the 20th, and Audree indicated that was correct, and we could get into further detail on that in agenda item 9.

8. Discussion regarding the future update of the Sedona Land Development Code.

Audree Juhlin indicated that the City Council approved the budget money for the update of the Land Development Code, and we had to consider how to accomplish that task, since it is like the analogy of how do you eat an elephant? The Land Development Code is rather large, and it will take a significant amount of time to evaluate, research and bring back proposed recommendations. Given the fact that we have a number of issues in the community that are high priority with sign regulations being one of them, we decided to take the Land Development Code amendments in small pieces. One of the first items the Commission will see is the Sign Code regulation amendments. We also will be bringing amendments to the Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance, and the Historic Preservation Commission is making recommendations to change Article 15 related to their purview, so those are the first three that the Commission will see. In the near future, we will be looking at the Wireless Communication Code and Parking Regulations as well, but it will be one piece at a time, because the magnitude is pretty extensive.

Commissioner Currivan indicated that he assumes that when staff does each piece, there will be corresponding changes in Article 2 to the definitions that are relevant to that section, and Audree stated absolutely.

Chair Losoff asked if there was any timeframe for that, and Audree indicated that the Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance will probably be before the Commission in November at the earliest and December at the latest; the Sign Code probably won't be until the first of 2016. The Chair asked if the Sign Code is impacted by the state, and Audree stated that it is significantly impacted by some legal opinions.

Commissioner Brandt asked about the priority with the community benefits package and if this is pushing that aside, and Audree indicated no, not at all. There was a lot of discussion on the community benefits policy and we decided to wait before it goes to the City Council for

consideration, until we had time to try it out on already approved projects and projects coming forward to evaluate how it is working and not working, to adjust it accordingly, and then take it to the City Council for consideration, so we are in the evaluation stage now. The Commissioner commented that since we don't have many new projects coming up, maybe we should evaluate old ones that we could compare side by side to see how things are and how they could have been, if it was implemented, and that might be enough to pull it together. Audree indicated that staff can bring the analysis we have done on prior approved projects, so that is a possibility. Commissioner Brandt noted that he would have thought that would have been a priority over the land use code. The Chair then indicated that he would kind of support that since every time a rezoning project comes up, one of the first questions is what the community benefits are, and we are all over the board, so it might be nice to get that accomplished. Audree Juhlin indicated that she can work with the Chair to figure out when to bring that forward.

9. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS

- a. Thursday, October 15, 2015; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
- b. Tuesday, October 20, 2015; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
- c. Thursday, October 29, 2015; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
- d. Tuesday, November 3, 2015; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**

Audree Juhlin indicated that starting with October 20th, we have a public hearing scheduled for Whole Foods; they are going to be proposing some exterior changes to their façade, and the question is if the Commission wants the public hearing on the 20th without a work session or if the Commission wants a work session on the 15th to discuss the details of their façade changes. Vice Chair Levin asked what staff recommends, and Audree indicated that in the interest of time and fairness for the Commission to have a good evaluation, she would recommend a work session on the 15th, and the Chair agreed.

Audree then stated that on October 15th, there will be a work session for the Whole Foods façade only, and going back to the 20th, it would be the public hearing for Whole Foods, and we are perhaps considering bringing the draft concepts for the Brewer Road Park Master Plan to the Commission for some reaction, as that moves forward. On October 29th, it is a work session and we are still waiting on some information from Thai Spices, but that Development Review has expired, so they need to start over for approvals. They basically are asking for re-approval of the prior approved project, so that could be a possibility for the work session on the 29th with a public hearing on November 3rd. Also on November 3rd, we have two extensions for consideration of Conditional Use Permits for the Tlaquepaque Farmers Market and the Wells Fargo Farmers Market, and that is what we have to date.

The Chair asked about the follow-up to tonight's discussion, and Audree Juhlin suggested letting staff get back together and look at what is being asked. We could easily bring a summary of what was discussed tonight to the work session on the 15th, but some of the data may take more time. The Chair asked about the 20th and hold off on Brewer Road. Audree indicated that staff could do that if that is the Commission's desire. The Chair stated that maybe that should be the priority to move that forward. Audree then indicated that she would place a continuation of tonight's discussion on the October 20th meeting and staff will get as much information as we can, then the Brewer Road Master Plan would be moved to the October 29th work session, in conjunction with the Thai Spices item.

The Chair noted that covers the rest of October and early part of November.

10. EXECUTIVE SESSION

If an Executive Session is necessary, it will be held in the Vultee Conference Room at 106 Roadrunner Drive. Upon a public majority vote of the members constituting a quorum, the Planning and Zoning Commission may hold an Executive Session that is not open to the public for the following purposes:

- a. To consult with legal counsel for advice on matters listed on this agenda per A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3).
- b. Return to open session. Discussion/possible action on executive session items.

No Executive Session was held.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Losoff called for adjournment at 7:20 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on October 6, 2015.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date